

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Fermann, et al.
Appl. No. : 10/608,233
Filed : June 30, 2003
For : IN-LINE, HIGH ENERGY FIBER
CHIRPED PULSE
AMPLIFICATION SYSTEM
Examiner : Mark Hellner
Group Art Unit : 3663
Confirmation No. : 1753

**CERTIFICATE OF EFS WEB
TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence, and any other attachment noted on the automated Acknowledgement Receipt, is being transmitted from within the Pacific Time zone to the Commissioner for Patents via the EFS Web server on:

June 11, 2007
(Date)

/Steven P. Ruden/
Steven P. Ruden, Ph.D., Reg. No. 53,538

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**Mail Stop Amendment**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of the claims in this application.

In the Notice of Allowability mailed March 12, 2007, the Examiner provided reasons for allowance of Claims 18, 19, and 56-79 stating that these claims are directed to the embodiment disclosed by Figure 6B. The Examiner states that in Figure 6B the stress-producing regions are shown in a unique fiber geometry, and a skilled artisan would not be led to the subject matter of the allowed claims as supported by Figure 6B.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statements to the extent that the reasons for allowance could be construed as limiting the allowed claims to the embodiment disclosed in Figure 6B or as defining any additional limitations not expressly set forth in the claims. Applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance to the extent there is any implication that patentability rests on a single limitation or a subset of the limitations of a claim, because it is the combination of limitations recited in each claim that makes each of the claims patentable. Applicants also note that the allowed claims recite different combinations of features and elements than referenced by the Examiner, and Applicants

Appl. No. : **10/608,233**
Filed : **June 30, 2003**

respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance to the extent that there is any implication that patentability of any of these claims is dependent on the other claims or the referenced features or that the claims are the same in scope. Additionally, Applicants note that the Examiner has characterized certain teachings of the cited art, and Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance to the extent that there is any implication that the Examiner's characterizations are complete or accurate or reflect Applicant's views of the cited art.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 11, 2007 By: /Steven P. Ruden/
Steven P. Ruden, Ph.D.
Registration No. 53,538
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

3632943
041007